

Response to Restriction Requirement  
U.S. Serial No. 10/619,380  
Filed: July 14, 2003  
Attorney Docket No: 281-398.01

## **REMARKS**

Claims 1-49 were presented.

Under 35 U.S.C. §121, claims 1-49 were made subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Claims 1-10 and 27-35 were designated as Group I, drawn to a method and apparatus for blood pressure measurement, and were classified in class 600, subclass 494.

Claims 11-26 and 36-49 were designated as Group II, drawn to a method and apparatus for blood pressure measurement, and were classified in class 600, subclass 496.

Applicants have amended independent claim 11 to depend from claim 1. In order to make the amendment, language reciting limitations already found in claim 1 was deleted from the claim. Only language referring to claim 1 and indicating that the remaining limitation was a further limitation of claim 1 was added to amended claim 11. No new matter was introduced by the amendment. Support for the amendment is found throughout the specification, drawings and claims as originally filed, and specifically in Figure 2 and the corresponding discussion at the paragraphs originally designated by the numerals [00042] through [00049]. Amended dependent claim 11 is not reduced in scope by the amendment.

Applicants have amended claim 21 which depends from claim 11 to remove a limitation already present in claim 1, which remains present in claim 21 by operation of 35 U.S.C. §112, 4<sup>th</sup> paragraph. In order to make the amendment, language was deleted from the claim. No new matter was introduced by the amendment. Support for the amendment is found throughout the specification, drawings and claims as originally filed, and specifically in Figure 2 and the corresponding discussion at the paragraphs originally designated by the numerals [00042] through [00049].

Applicants have amended independent claim 36 to depend from claim 27. In order to make the amendment, language reciting limitations already found in claim 27 was deleted from the claim. Only language referring to claim 27 and indicating that the remaining limitation was a further limitation of claim 27 was added to amended claim 36. No new matter was introduced by the amendment. Support for the amendment is found throughout the specification, drawings and claims as originally filed, and specifically in Figure 2 and the corresponding discussion at the paragraphs originally designated by the

Response to Restriction Requirement  
U.S. Serial No. 10/619,380  
Filed: July 14, 2003  
Attorney Docket No: 281-398.01

numerals [00042] through [00049]. Amended dependent claim 36 is not reduced in scope by the amendment.

### CONCLUSION

Applicants have amended independent claims 11 and 36 to make them depend, respectively, from independent claims 1 and 27. Applicants have amended claim 21 to remove unnecessary or redundant limitations.

Applicants believe that any ground for making a Restriction Requirement is made moot by the amendments presented. Appicants respectfully request that the Restriction Requirement be withdrawn. Applicants submit that Claims 1-49 are now in proper condition for allowance, and request the issuance of a Notice of Allowance at the Examiner's earliest convenience.

If the Examiner believes that contact with Applicant's attorney would be advantageous toward the disposition of this case, the Examiner is requested to call Applicant's attorney at the phone number noted below.

Respectfully submitted,  
**WALL MARJAMA & BILINSKI LLP**

By:

  
Joseph B. Milstein, Ph. D., Reg. No. 42,897  
250 South Clinton Street, Suite 300  
Syracuse, NY 13202  
Telephone: (315) 425-9000  
Facsimile: (315) 425-9114

Date: November 9, 2006

JBM/cmn

Customer No.: \*20874\*  
20874  
PATENT TRADEMARK OFFICE